

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application; and in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the prior art, principally U.S. Patents 5,812,768 (Page, et al.) and 6,438,744 (Toutonghi, et al.). More specifically, Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-19 and 21-27 were rejected as being unpatentable over Page, et al. in view of Toutonghi, et al, and Claims 7, 14 and 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Page, et al. in view of Toutonghi, et al. and further in view of "Official Notice" that converting data by code page is well known.

Independent Claims 1, 8, 17, 22 and 26 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. For the reasons discussed below, Claims 1-27 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, accordingly, requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-27 and to allow these claims.

The present invention provides a procedure for mapping from a first program written in a first language to a second program written in another language. In this procedure, an interface is generated for translating data types from the first language to the second language, formatting data from the first language to the second language, and handling other matters necessary for the sharing of data between different programming environments. This interface is generated using information or data obtained from the first program.

Page, et al, the primary reference relied on to reject the claims, describes an architecture for a service broker, which brokers services between a client and a server and allows for adapters that can convert foreign communications protocol to the function server protocol. The adapter would be necessary when exposing existing IMS services. Page, et

al, though, does not describe how to accomplish this. Also, Page, et al, has the input buffer or the receive length field define the size of the output buffer (column 11, lines 5-20), which is fixed in size. It does not allow for the dynamic size of IMS messages.

Toutonghi, et al discloses a procedure for mapping software component interfaces. In particular, this procedure is used to map dynamically between class objects representing components defined in two differing software development environments. In one disclosed embodiment, a computerized system has an operating system that provides interface for controlling two components, with each component interface having methods, properties and events.

The present invention provides a procedure for exposing IMS services. What distinguishes this invention from the prior art, including Page, et al. and Toutonghi, et al, is that this invention is able to process a dynamic IMS message, where the structure of a message is known, but its content is variant. For example, an IMS message contains Lpages, where the order of the Lpages is known, but an Lpage itself can repeat. An Lpage contains segments; and in any given segment sequence, one or more of the segments may be omitted. A segment contains fields; and some or all of the fields can be omitted in a segment. Fields can have different types, for instance, any type that is possible for COBOL. Thus, the marshalling for a field may involve conversion of characters, different number types and more.

Independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 26 clearly describe the above-discussed difference between this invention and the prior art. Specifically, Claims 1, 8 and 22 describe the IMS program as receiving input and output messages having variant content, and both of these claims describe the generated program interface as, among other

functions, dynamically composing or reading the input or output messages having variant content. Claims 15, 17, 24 and 26 also describe the IMS program as receiving input and output messages having variant content. Claims 15 and 24 further describe the feature of scanning an IMS transaction with that program to dynamically compose or read the input or output messages; and Claims 17 and 26 describe the features of using information obtained from that program to invoke an IMS transaction with the program, and composing or reading those input or output messages.

The above-described feature of the invention is of utility because it allows the desired interfacing to occur even when the IMS messages have a dynamic size.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 26, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is obvious in view of the prior art. Consequently, these Claims 1, 8, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 26 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable.

Claims 2-7 and 21 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 9-14 are dependent from Claim 8 and are allowable therewith. Claim 16 is dependent from, and is allowable with, Claim 15; and Claims 18-20 are dependent from Claim 17 and are allowable therewith. Similarly, Claims 23, 25 and 27 are dependent from, and are allowable with Claims 22, 24 and 26, respectively. The Examiner is, accordingly, requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow these claims.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy